

REMARKS

This amendment is being filed, along with a request for a one-month time extension, in response to an Office Action mailed 04/05/2007, in which the Examiner said that claims 1-35 were pending but rejected. In this amendment, claims 1, 8, 13, 20, 25, and 32 are amended to overcome reasons given by the Examiner for objections and rejections, and other reasons for rejections are traversed below.

Grammatical corrections are made in claims 8 and 20, with "a selected one of the authentication" being replaced with "a selected authentication."

Claims Rejected on the Ground of Double Patenting

The Examiner said that claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16-18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28-30, 32, and 33 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over various claims of the copending Application No. 10/637,182. A terminal disclaimer is filed herewith to overcome this provisional rejection.

Claims Rejected under 35 USC §101

The Examiner additionally said that claims 1-4 and 5-11 were rejected under 35 USC §101 because the language of the claims raises a question whether the claim is directed merely to the abstract idea that is not tied to an environment or a machine which would result in a practical operation producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result. The Examiner particularly directed this comment to independent claims 1 and 5.

Regarding claims 1 and 5, in this amendment, these claims are modified to require that the filter must pass files tagged according to the selected location to an application executing within the computer and that files blocked by the filter are not passed to the application executing in the computer. Support for this change is found in the application as filed, being described, for example, in page 13, lines 11-16 of the

specification and shown in FIG. 4.

The Applicants respectfully submit that these changes are sufficient to indicate that claim 1 describes a program product for implementing a method resulting in a practical operation producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result, in the form of data being made available to a program executing within a computing system on a basis of the input data. The usefulness of such a method, for example in terms of using a computer to do certain things as a function of the individual using the computer is further explained in the Applicants' specification.

Claims Rejected under 35 USC §103

Regarding claims 1-4, 13-16, and 25-28, the Examiner also said that these claims were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,327,633 to Watts, hereinafter *Watts*, in view of U.S. Pat. No. U.S. Pat. No. 7,058,847 to Guzman et al., hereinafter *Guzman*.

Regarding claims 1, 13, and 25, in this amendment, this claim is modified to require that the filter must pass files tagged according to the selected personality to an application executing within the computer and that files not tagged according to the selected location are blocked from being passed to the application. Support for this change is found in the application as filed, being described, for example, in page 13, lines 11-16, of the specification and shown in FIG. 4. In addition, these claims are modified to include a requirement that the personality selection input is not provided in response to a prompt provided in response to determining that a location of the computer has changed. Support for this modification is found in the specification on page 8, line 25, through page 9, line 13. It is further noted that certain embodiments of the Applicants invention do not have a means for determining a location of the computer.

In the above-mentioned Office Action, the Examiner said *Watts*, in column 10, lines 35-

65, describes accepting a personality selection input provided by a user to the computer.

However, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Watts* nor *Guzman*, taken separately or in combination, describe the requirement of claim 1, as amended herein, for the personality selection input to not be provided in response to a prompt provided in response to determining that a location of the computer has changed. Instead, in column 10, lines 34-39 and 55-60, *Watts* describes prompting the user, in response to determining that the location has changed, to provide an indication of whether he wants the system configuration to be changed to one associated with the new location. Thus, *Watts* merely uses this input from the user to provide an opportunity to override the determination of a new location for the computer. *Guzman* does not describe the use of personality information inputs, with the tagging applied by *Guzman* being applied according to the network element with which file data is associated.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended herein is patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over *Watts* in view of *Guzman*.

Regarding claims 2, 4, 6, 14, 16, and 28, the Applicants respectfully submit that, since each of these dependent claims merely add limitations to claim 1, 13, or 25, these claims are patentable, for reasons described above regarding claim 1, 13, and 25 under 35 USC 103(a) over *Watts* in view of *Guzman*.

Regarding claim 3, 15, and 27, the Examiner said that *Watts* discloses wherein accepting personality selection input accepts the input as a function of user login identity information, citing, from column 10, "...if the user accepts the changes the configuration is changed.. "

However, the Applicant respectfully submits that the individual using a computer is referred to as "the user" whether or not he has provided login information. A computer

not requiring login information has a user. There is no mention in *Watts* of using user logon information. In *Guzman*, files are tagged according to the network element with which the data in the files is associated, not according to user logon information.

Therefore, and additionally because claims 3, 15, and 27 merely add this limitation to claims 1, 13, and 25, respectively, which are believed to be patentable as described above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3, 15, and 27 are under 35 USC 103(a) over *Watts* in view of *Guzman*.

Regarding claims 5-12, 17-24, and 29-35, the Examiner said that these claims were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Watts* in view of *Guzman* and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,857,021 to Kataoka, hereinafter *Kataoka*.

Regarding claims 6, 18, and 30, the Examiner said that *Watts* and *Guzman* do not explicitly disclose storing files in an encrypted format and decrypting the files that have been stored, but that *Kataoka* discloses storing files in an encrypted form, as described in the Abstract and shown in FIG. 6, and decrypting the files that have been in an encrypted format on the storage device.

The Applicants respectfully submit that *Watts*, *Guzman*, and *Kataoka*, taken singly or in combination, do not teach or describe the requirement of these claims for, when at least one application is executed in the computer, a change in the selected personality based on a change in the selected personality does not require termination of the at least one application. There is no indication of this type of operation in any of the cited references.

The Applicants further notes that *Kataoka* teaches storing encryption keys that are used according to system ID's associated with messages, not according to the personality selection of the host computer. In fact, there is no suggestion in *Kataoka* that the personality of the host computer can or should be expected to change.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5, 17, and 29 are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over *Watts* in view of *Guzman* and further in view of *Kataoka*.

Regarding claim 6, 18, and 30, the Examiner said that *Guzman* discloses the code which implements the filter which further passes files tagged as universal irrespective of the selected personality and thereby overrides the filter action, citing column 13, lines 5-15, column 11, lines 60-67, and column 12, lines 1-10.

Regarding this statement, the Applicants respectfully submit that *Guzman* is not describing the establishment of a universal code, that would be applied to files to be used in all of the network elements, but rather alternative ways of establishing naming conventions to indicate the particular network element for which a file contains data, as described particularly in column 13, lines 13-17.

Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully submit that *Watts*, *Guzman*, and *Kataoka*, taken singly or in combination, do not teach or describe the requirement of these claims that the filter further passes files tagged as universal irrespective of the selected location and thereby overrides the filter action (b) which otherwise blocks files not tagged according to the selected personality.

Only *Guzman* teaches the use of tagged files, with such files each having a tag identifying a network element for which data within the files is stored. There is no indication within *Guzman* that any files would be tagged as universal, or that any files would be blocked from transmission to an application.

Therefore, and additionally because claims 6, 18, and 30 merely add this limitation to claims 5, 16, and 27, respectively, which are believed to be patentable as described above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is patentable 35 USC §103(a) over *Watts* in view of *Guzman* and further in view of *Kataoka*.

Regarding claim 7, 19, and 31, because these claims merely add limitations to claims 6, 18, and 30, respectively, which are believed to be patentable as described above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7, 18, and 28 are patentable 35 USC §103(a) over *Watts* in view of *Guzman* and further in view of *Kataoka*.

Regarding claim 8, 20, and 32, because these claims merely add limitations to claims 5, 17, and 29, respectively, which are believed to be patentable as described above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8, 20, and 32 are patentable 35 USC §103(a) over *Watts* in view of *Guzman* and further in view of *Kataoka*.


Regarding claims 9, 21, and 33, because these claims merely add limitations to claims 5, 17, and 29, respectively, which are believed to be patentable as described above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9, 21, and 33 are patentable 35 USC §103(a) over *Watts* in view of *Guzman* and further in view of *Kataoka*.

Regarding claim 10, 22, and 34, because these claims merely add limitations to claims 5, 17, and 29, respectively, which are believed to be patentable as described above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, 22, and 34 are patentable 35 USC §103(a) over *Watts* in view of *Guzman* and further in view of *Kataoka*.

Regarding claim 11, 22, and 35, because these claims merely add limitations to claims 5, 17, and 29, respectively, which are believed to be patentable as described above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11, 22, and 35 are patentable 35 USC §103(a) over *Watts* in view of *Guzman* and further in view of *Kataoka*.

Regarding claim 12 and 24, because these claims merely add limitations to claims 5, and 17, respectively, which are believed to be patentable as described above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 and 24 are patentable 35 USC §103(a) over *Watts* in view of *Guzman* and further in view of *Kataoka*.

Respectfully submitted:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ronald V. Davidge". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Ronald" being more prominent.

Ronald V. Davidge

Registration No. 33,863

Telephone No. 954-344-9880

June 20, 2007